

Message

From: Elsen, Henry [Elsen.Henry@epa.gov]
Sent: 4/7/2014 6:18:59 PM
To: Duffy, William [William.Duffy@dgsllaw.com]
CC: Greene, Nikia [Greene.Nikia@epa.gov]; Sparks, Sara [sparks.sara@epa.gov]; Vranka, Joe [vranka.joe@epa.gov]; Griffin, Susan [Griffin.Susan@epa.gov]; Strausbaugh, Dan [Strausbaugh.Dan@epa.gov]; Dan Powers [dpowers@bsb.mt.gov]
Subject: RE: Questions I would like addressed at the Public Meetings on the Butte Superfund Health Study

Bill,

EPA views the public meetings as an opportunity for all work group participants to respond to public questions, in the manner that makes most sense at the time. EPA participants will be looking at these questions but I encourage AR folks to be thinking about them too. Nikia and BSB will be coordinating on meeting preparation with AR and others, and perhaps some more clarity about meeting logistics will happen as that process occurs.

Henry

From: Duffy, William [mailto:William.Duffy@dgsllaw.com]
Sent: Sunday, April 06, 2014 10:28 AM
To: Elsen, Henry
Subject: FW: Questions I would like addressed at the Public Meetings on the Butte Superfund Health Study

Henry – I'm not certain, but I believe there may also be a Q&A session that BSB has scheduled for the morning of April 9th (which is why Mr. Ray refers to "meetings" in the plural). There is a CTEC meeting on April 8th as well.

Bill

From: Duffy, William
Sent: Sunday, April 06, 2014 10:15 AM
To: 'Elsen, Henry'
Subject: FW: Questions I would like addressed at the Public Meetings on the Butte Superfund Health Study

Henry – please see the email string below that includes 'questions' from Mr. Ray that he demands be answered at the upcoming public meeting (Wednesday, April 9th I believe) related to the Butte health study. Environ has shared Mr. Ray's comments with Nikia and others who are part of the working group. Will EPA take the lead in responding to Mr. Ray?

Bill

BILL DUFFY PARTNER

P: 303.892.7372 • F: 303.893.1379 • M: 720.234.5971 • [vcard](#)

Davis Graham & Stubbs LLP

1550 17th Street, Suite 500 • Denver, CO 80202



Dina L. Johnson | Senior Manager

From: Dina Johnson

Sent: Sunday, April 06, 2014 7:00 AM

To: Dan Strausbaugh; DeWitt, Lisa; Dina Johnson; Griffin, Joe; Harris, Cord; 'Michelle Watters' (Watters.Michelle@epamail.epa.gov); 'Nikia Greene'; R. S. Dan Powers (dpowers@bsb.mt.gov); Rosalind Schoof; 'Sara Sparks'; Steve Ackerlund (steve.ackerlund@bresnan.net); Susan Griffin (griffin.susan@epa.gov); 'Helen Joyce' (helen.joyce@mse-ta.com); jcornish@pioneer-technical.com; 'john.pullman@mercurystmed.com'; 'Shannon.holland@sjh-mt.org'

Cc: Cynthia Van Landingham; Hassler, Eric

Subject: FW: Questions I would like addressed at the Public Meetings on the Butte Superfund Health Study

FYI.



Dina L. Johnson | Senior Manager

From: John Ray [<mailto:bodinman2003@yahoo.com>]

Sent: Sunday, April 06, 2014 6:40 AM

To: Rosalind Schoof; Dina Johnson

Subject: Questions I would like addressed at the Public Meetings on the Butte Superfund Health Study

I would like the following questions addressed at the Public Meetings on the Health Study.

1. Butte was promised an independent peer review of the study. This independent peer review was supposed to be part of the process of developing and conducting the health study. It was not supposed to be an after the fact endeavor that would have no impact on the design and conduct of the study. EPA appears to be reneging on that promise. Now all the agency promises us is that at some time after the process is finished some condensed version of the study will be submitted for possible publication. It was also stated by EPA that this review would not change the study. Such a review will have no impact on the design and conduct of the study as EPA originally promised. What good is it? Why is EPA afraid to have its work independently reviewed? Having a condensed article published is not the kind of independent peer review EPA promised. What the public is left with is that the EPA and its associates will be reviewing their own work. What assurances can the public have that this report was done in an unbiased manner and done correctly? Without an independent peer review, the public can have NO such assurance. Why has EPA reneged on its promise? What is EPA afraid of discovering?

2. The purpose of the study is to demonstrate that the Residential Metals Abatement Program is working. I support the program but the methodology the study uses is faulty. It is an example of the "post hoc, ergo propter hoc" fallacy. On the one hand the study says the Residential Metals Abatement Program exists. On the other hand the study says that lead levels are dropping in Butte. The unproved assumption is that the first is the cause of the second. Yet, no methodology is utilized in the study to demonstrate this causal link.

How was this causality established?

Also, just because lead levels in Butte are approaching the national average, is the national average protective of human health? No data to warrant this conclusion is provided by the study.

3. By looking only at lead levels, the study does not give a big picture view of the entire toxics problem in Butte. We are told that the studies will be going on for some 30 plus years. By the time the studies are completed the point of the effectiveness of Superfund in Butte will be largely mute. We need some assurance for the residents of Butte currently alive that Superfund is working. This is just another example of the EPA dragging things out to the point that people either die or are no longer interested.

4. The study ignores environmental justice concerns. How is environmental justice incorporated into the design and execution of the health study?

5. Stacie Barry's peer reviewed study reached the conclusion that Superfund overall in Butte was not working and that public health was not being protected. We now have an EPA funded study that reaches the opposite

conclusion. Why should we believe this EPA produced study? How is the EPA study better than the work that Stacie did? Is this EPA study simply a PR effort by EPA to refute Stacie's conclusions?

6. Why has EPA refused to change its action levels on lead to be congruent with the CDC recommendations? Is this a one size fits all approach?

7. What assurances can the public have that the toxics of concern have been properly characterized?

I will be raising other questions during the comment period but I think the above are a good place to start. Please address these at your public meetings.

Dr. John W. Ray

This message contains information that may be confidential, privileged or otherwise protected by law from disclosure. It is intended for the exclusive use of the Addressee(s). Unless you are the addressee or authorized agent of the addressee, you may not review, copy, distribute or disclose to anyone the message or any information contained within. If you have received this message in error, please contact the sender by electronic reply to email@environcorp.com and immediately delete all copies of the message.